

REMARKS

Claims 7-9 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Imasu et al. (US 6,208,525) in view of Iijima et al. (US 2003/0011070), and claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Imasu et al. in view of Iijima et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claim 7 recites a package substrate including, in part, “a solder resist having a first portion contacting the upper surface of the base substrate and the plated pattern layer and a second portion contacting the lower surface of the base substrate and the solder ball pads.”

In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Imasu et al. explicitly discloses that the passivation layer 5 is spaced apart from an upper surface of the rigid board 2 by an epoxy layer 3. Accordingly, Imasu et al. fails to teach or suggest a package substrate including, in part, “a solder resist having a first portion contacting the upper surface of the base substrate and the plated pattern layer and a second portion contacting the lower surface of the base substrate and the solder ball pads,” as required by independent claim 7, and hence dependent claims 8-14.

Similarly, Iijima et al. fails to remedy the deficiencies of Imasu et al. since Iijima et al. fails to teach or suggest a package substrate including, in part, “a solder resist having a first portion contacting the upper surface of the base substrate and the plated pattern layer and a second portion contacting the lower surface of the base substrate and the solder ball pads,” as required by independent claim 7. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Iijima et al. fails to expressly provide any motivation with which to modify Imasu et al. to arrive at Applicants’ presently claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Imasu et al. and Iijima et al., whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest “a solder resist

having a first portion contacting the upper surface of the base substrate and the plated pattern layer and a second portion contacting the lower surface of the base substrate and the solder ball pads,” as recited by independent claim 7, and hence dependent claims 8-14.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied art does not teach or suggest the novel combination of features recited by independent claim 7, and hence dependent claims 8-14.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: February 28, 2006

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001